



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/802,169

03/17/2004

Harumi Itoh

JP920030031US1

3836

25259

7590

04/15/2008

IBM CORPORATION

3039 CORNWALLIS RD.

DEPT. T81 / B503, PO BOX 12195

REASEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709

EXAMINER

HAN, QI

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2626

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/15/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

RSWIPLAW@us.ibm.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/802,169	Applicant(s) ITOH ET AL.	
	Examiner QI HAN	Art Unit 2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 February 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This communication is responsive to the applicant's amendment filed on 02/05/2008.

The applicant cancelled claim 12-14.

The examiner withdraws the disclosure objections, because the applicant amended or clarified the corresponding contents of specification and cancelled the corresponding claims.

The examiner withdraws the claim rejection under 35 USC 101, because the applicant cancelled the corresponding claims.

It is also noted that the examiner withdraws the claim allowability of the previous office action filed on 11/06/2007, because the claims are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection based on the new evidence of combined prior art teachings and/or reconsideration of the interpretations of the claim limitations (see below).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 1-11, the claims include (or inherit) limitation "... **should be** registered ...", which is/are not positive limitation(s) because it is unclear that the limitation is really part(s)

Art Unit: 2626

of the claimed invention or just optional part(s) of the claimed invention, so as being indefinite.

As best understood, the limitation will be interpreted as "...is registered..." hereinafter.

Further, claims 2-7, recite or include (i.e. inherit from the parent claims) the limitation "said registration **destination** selection unit" respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim(s).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 7 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MATSUNAGA et al. (US 2003/0088568 A1) hereinafter referenced as MATSUNAGA in view of MOORE (US 2004/0098247 A1).

As per **claim 1**, as best understood in view of the claim rejection under 35 USC 112 2nd (see above), MATSUNAGA discloses 'electronic bulletin board system (BBS)' (title), 'providing with a translation section used to produce translated messages (documents)' (abstract), comprising:

"a dictionary management unit (the dictionary section) for managing a plurality of categorized dictionaries classified (a plurality of specialized dictionaries classified by the category) according to predetermined categories", (p22);

“a phrase extraction unit for extracting a noun phrase from said document”, (p115, ‘extracts message data corresponding to strings of characters’ such as a name, i.e. a noun phrase);

“a registration category selection unit for selecting a category on which said extracted noun phrase should be registered among a plurality of categories corresponding to said plurality of categorized dictionaries, respectively”, (Fig. 5 and p159-p164, ‘message registering section’; ‘a database classified by each category in the hierarchical structure’; ‘components classify in accordance with hierarchical categories’, a mechanism ‘to select a dictionary corresponding to the category of messages to be translated’ ‘using one or more dictionaries selected’, wherein the terminology in the sport dictionaries is also read noun phrase’; also see p177);

“a translation unit for translating said noun phrase to generate a noun phrase translation which is a translation of said noun phrase”, (p162-p164, ‘the translation processing section’, ‘translation executing section used to perform the translation’).

Even though MATSUNAGA discloses “said categorized dictionary corresponding to the category selected by said registration category selection unit” as stated above, MATSUNAGA does not expressly disclose “a dictionary registration unit for registering a **pair** of said noun phrase and said noun phrase translation on said categorized dictionary.” However, the feature is well known in the art as evidenced by MOORE who discloses ‘statistical method and apparatus for learning translation relationships among phrases’ (title), comprising ‘learning phrase translation’ with ‘bilingual dictionaries’ (p64), ‘phrase translation leaning component 400 then leans the associations between the selected marked source language phrases (including noun phrases) and their translations in the aligned target language sentences, and output the translation

Art Unit: 2626

pairs' (p66), 'the phrase pairs and associated scores are provided (registered) to dictionary merge component 216 which merges (registers) the phrase pairs and scores into bilingual dictionary 220' (p67), 'captions (multi-words)' such as 'View As Web Page' (noun phrase)(p69).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify MATSUNAGA by providing a mechanism of combining phrase pairs into bilingual dictionary for translation, as taught by MOORE, for the purpose (motivation) of improving the performance of parsing and translating the input for a machine translation system (MOORE: p67 and p71).

As per **claim 7** (depending on claim 1), MATSUNAGA in view of MOORE further discloses that "wherein said translation unit translates said noun phrase to generate said noun phrase translation on the basis of **prioritized** use of said categorized dictionary corresponding to the category which is selected by said registration [destination] selection unit and on which said noun phrase should be registered", (MOORE: p188, 'the setting is made so that the dictionary in the lower order category is given a high priority for use', which is read on the claim).

As per **claim 9** (depending on claim 1), MATSUNAGA in view of MOORE further discloses that:

"a translation word generation unit for generating a noun phrase translation candidate as a candidate for said noun phrase translation", (MOORE: p23, 'finding noun phrase'; p24, 'phrase translation', 'candidate phrases in a target language are generated');

"a page search unit for searching pages on a network to find pages containing said noun phrase translation candidate", (MATSUNAGA: p55-58, 'terminal device that can access the BBS through the network' with 'Web browser', 'user can browse (search) HTML documents');

81, 'page generating section', 'produces message information (HYML documents) to be used in the Web pages that can be browsed (searched)'); and

“a noun phrase translation generation unit which makes a selection as to whether or not said noun phrase translation candidate should be selected as said noun phrase translation on the basis of whether or not any page containing said noun phrase translation candidate has been hit”, (MATSUNAGA: p55-58, wherein, one skill in the art would have been recognized that 'Internet (WWW system)' would include search engine in some Web sites (such as Google) for browsing/searching documents for 'Web browser', and the phrase (including noun phrase) of the browsed page(s) would be treated in the same way as that of the message(s) as stated above (see claim1); MOORE: claim 1, 'identifying the translation relationship between the source language phrase and the candidate phrase based on the score', one skill in the art would have been recognized that determining (selecting) phrase translation in testing phase would be in the same way as identifying the translation relationship in the learning/training phase, the result would also be the same and predictable, i.e. the phrase (noun phrase) having a score corresponding to highest probability would be selected).

As per **claim 10**, it recites a dictionary updating server. As best understood in view of the rejection under 35 USC 112 2nd (see above), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 1, because the rejection for claim 1 covers the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 10, wherein the combined teachings from MATSUNAGA (Fig. 1 and p55-p56 and p84) and MOORE (p53-p54) are read on the claimed “terminal”, “server”, “updating dictionaries” and “dictionary updating server.”

As per **claim 11**, it recites a dictionary updating server. As best understood in view of the rejection under 35 USC 112 2nd (see above), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 10, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 10.

4. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MATSUNAGA and MOORE as applied to claim 1, and further in view of TAKEDA et al. (US 5,477,450) hereinafter referenced as TAKEDA.

As per **claim 8** (depending on claim 1), even though MATSUNAGA in view of MOORE discloses “a grammatical rule for a translation result as a noun phrase in the case of generating said noun phrase translation” (MATSUNAGA: p67, ‘the translation dictionary section contains ...grammar (grammatical rule)’), MATSUNAGA in view of MOORE does not expressly disclose “said translation unit sets a higher priority... for a translation result as a noun phrase in the case of generating said noun phrase translation, in comparison with translation of a portion other than the noun phrase in said document.” However, the feature is well known in the art as evidenced by TAKEDA who discloses ‘machine translation method and apparatus’ (title), comprising that ‘if higher priority is given to idiomatic phrase patterns, idiomatic phrases can be so designed as to take priority over literal interpretations’ (col. 10, lines 43-45), ‘giving high priority variable such that the word meanings and equivalents of the contiguous phrase are likely to contribute to the realization of the variable determining an equivalent of the noun phrase’ (col. 10, lines 58-61). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify MATSUNAGA in view of MOORE by providing high priority for noun phrase translation, as taught by TAKEDA, for the purpose (motivation) of

Art Unit: 2626

establishing the optimum correspondence between the source text and translated text for machine translation (TAKEDA: col. 2, lines 36-42).

Conclusion

5. Please address mail to be delivered by the United States Postal Service (USPS) as follows:

Mail Stop ____
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or faxed to: 571-273-8300, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or: 571-273-8300, (for informal or draft communications, and please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

If no Mail Stop is indicated below, the line beginning Mail Stop should be omitted from the address.

Effective January 14, 2005, except correspondence for Maintenance Fee payments, Deposit Account Replenishments (see 1.25(c)(4)), and Licensing and Review (see 37 CFR 5.1(c) and 5.2(c)), please address correspondence to be delivered by other delivery services (Federal Express (Fed Ex), UPS, DHL, Laser, Action, Purolater, etc.) as follows:

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Window, Mail Stop ____
Randolph Building
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Qi Han whose telephone numbers is (571) 272-7604. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 9:00 a.m. to 7:30 p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil, can be reached on (571) 272-7602.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Inquiries regarding the status of submissions relating to an application or questions on the Private PAIR system should be directed to the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 703-305-3028 between the hours of 6 a.m. and midnight Monday through Friday EST, or by e-mail at: ebc@uspto.gov. For general information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>.

QH/qh
April 7, 2008
/Qi Han/ Examiner, Art Unit 2626